

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/600,343

Applicant(s)

JOHANSSON ET AL.

Examiner

Michael I Poe

Art Unit

1732

All Participants:

Status of Application:

(1) *Michael I Poe (Examiner).*

(3) _____.

(2) John Ledzey (Applicant's attorney).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 31 March 2004

Time: 12:30 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None specifically

Claims discussed:

1 and 3-11

Prior art documents discussed:

None specifically

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Michael Roe

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called the applicant's attorney to discuss proposed amendments necessary to place the claims in condition for allowance. In addition, the examiner informed the applicant's attorney that the amendment filed on February 24, 2004 was considered non-compliant due to improper status identifiers and that the terminal disclaimer filed on February 24, 2004 was disapproved for lacking a statement of interest. As such, the applicant would be required to file a compliant amendment and a proper terminal disclaimer to place the application in condition for allowance.

With regard to the claim amendments, although the examiner indicated that the applicant's arguments in the response filed on February 24, 2004 were found persuasive, the examiner stipulated that the scope of claim 7 was not commensurate with the applicant's arguments. Specifically, claim 7 did not require the use of a hydrophobizing resin. As such, the examiner proposed amending claim 7 to specify that the resin was a hydrophobizing resin. In addition, the examiner proposed various other amendments to the claims to correct typographical errors and potential problems under 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph. The applicant's attorney approved the proposed amendments and authorized the examiner to proceed with the changes via Examiner's Amendment upon the filing of a compliant amendment and a proper terminal disclaimer. Refer to the Examiner's Amendment for a complete listing of agreed upon changes.